THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE

Human Events
THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 18 May 5, 1960 Section 1 — News

**KOREA:** *State Department's meddling* (page 1)
**FRANCE:** *New atomic weapons planned* (page 1)
**LABOR:** *Supreme Court vs. working man* (page 2)
**KENNEDY:** *Using the religious issue ....* (page 2)
**EDUCATION:** *Bureaucracy and bombast* (page 4)

**Korea—Another Cuba?:** Capitol Hill early last week pierced the smokescreen of State Department propaganda on Syngman Rhee and Korea, when it read in the papers that (1) Red China had been broadcasting appeals to Korea to overthrow Rhee; and (2) Secretary Herter blessed mob rule in Seoul to oust the tough old President, overwhelmingly elected by popular vote just a month ago.

This picture tipped off members of Congress that the same old "soft on communism" clique in the State Department that had sold free China down the river to the Reds, and more recently had helped install the Communist Castro regime, were at work again undermining the Free World Front against the Kremlin. This element in State had its mouthpiece, Secretary Herter, intervene on the side of mob rule with a public note rebuking Rhee when he sought to put down the riots. Even State Department functionaries admitted that the note had no precedent in our diplomatic history.

**Ironically, the State Department circles assailed Rhee with the epithet "stubborn," just when Congress enthusiastically received French President De Gaulle, long criticized by our officials for being "stubborn."**

A stormy session in the White House between President Eisenhower and Republican leaders followed the extraordinary action of Secretary Herter. Ike weakly echoed the State Department denial that any Communist influence was behind the *coup d'etat.* GOP members of Congress tartly replied, "We don't believe that."

Congressmen quoted extensively from the Washington *Evening Star* which led the press attack on the policy pursued by the State Department. This old, restrained and usually placid organ ran two fiery editorials denouncing Herter for aiding mob rule in Korea and asked: "Are Mr. Herter and his associates really prepared to do business in Korea with a new leader—possibly one cast in the Fidel Castro mold?"

Diplomatic sources pointed out that Herter's action would be interpreted in Asia as "pulling the rug from under" the Rhee anti-Communist regime and would react badly on Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, on the Philippines and on Pakistan—the string of Asian "reliables" in the bulwark against the Red tide.

In Japan, diplomats reminded reporters, the repercussions would be bad. Week before last, the Japanese Diet failed to ratify the US-Japan Mutual Assistance Treaty, after socialists, fellow-travellers and Communists opposed it.

*In Washington, those who know the drift of State Department policy today believe that the Herter intervention against the anti-Communist Rhee was part of a design called the "Bohlen policy," after Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen, who helped Roosevelt appease Stalin at Yalta, and who recently returned to the State Department.*

Despite vigorous protests from Republican senators, Bohlen was given a key job as "adviser." On January 21 HUMAN EVENTS reported that Bohlen has a plan to disarm Chiang Kai-shek and neutralize Formosa, as part of a global appeasement scheme. Today observers think the Korean adventure is one segment of this scheme—the liquidation of free South Korea, and the destruction of other free world bastions in Asia followed by recognition of Red China as master in that part of Asia.

On Capitol Hill, politicos try to figure out the results of this appeasement on the political picture this election year. From 1950 to 1952, the Republicans successfully took the offensive against the Truman regime's "appeasement" in the Far East. Today, ex-President Truman utters sharp criticisms of the Eisenhower Administration's appeasement. Will the roles be reversed and will the country rally to a Democratic offensive of this sort?

One straw in the wind appears. When Christian Herter in 1952 ran for election for the Governorship of his native state of Massachusetts and again when he successfully ran for re-election in 1954, the New Bedford *Standard-Times,* a powerful newspaper in that state, backed him enthusiastically. Today, this pro-Herter paper turns on its erstwhile favorite for what it terms his "unbelievable attack" on Syngman Rhee, and editorially calls on Herter to resign.

**De Gaulle Visit:** French military men accompanying their President leaked out some information to their American cohorts, which has not reached the press, as follows:

(1) France plans a test explosion of another atomic bomb in the near future. It will take place in French Antarctica.

(2) France is now in process of producing an Intermediate Range Ballistics Missile (an IRBM). This missile has a range sufficient to reach Soviet Russia.

(3) France is now constructing seven new-type tactical nuclear weapons.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS • In Four Sections

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The French visitors would give no further details to US military men, pointing out that since the US gives details of such information only to Britain, and excludes France, "secrecy is mutual."

**Capitol Camera:** North Dakota Governor (and GOP candidate for the late Senator Langer's seat in a special June election) John Davis has sounded what many consider the keynote for Republican farm state candidates with his flat statement that Secretary Benson should be replaced. Results of the June 28 election will be thoroughly analyzed by GOP strategists.

• "Vain" Morse now says he is a genuine candidate for the Democratic nomination, claiming the convention will be deadlocked for at least ten ballots and that "anything can happen."

• Reportedly the Castro regime is preparing a resolution for the UN demanding that the US abandon its Guantanamo Bay naval base. HUMAN EVENTS foreshadowed this development on April 14, 1958, before Castro replaced Batista.

• More money set for the coffers of the enterprising Roosevelt family with the filming of *Sunrise At Campobello*, a soap opera about FDR and his clan. Classic beauty Greer Garson has been cast as Eleanor!

**• Nelson Rockefeller stumped for Dartmouth roommate Herman Schneebeli in the latter's winning try for a vacant GOP House seat from Pennsylvania. But Schneebeli ran far below his predecessor's lowest plurality, and observers now question Rocky's strength on a GOP Presidential ticket.**

• Harold Stassen has again launched a "stop Nixon" movement in the form of a "loaded questionnaire" about Nixon to convention delegates. Childe Harold's effort boomeranged; the reaction against Stassen fed the big total for Nixon in the Pennsylvania primary—say Keystone State observers.

• The Capital cliche that "the State Department doesn't know the time of day" was confirmed last week; two days after daylight saving time had gone into effect, half of the State Department's clocks were running an hour slow.

**Goldwater:** On April 23, the Arizona GOP state convention enthusiastically pledged its 14 national convention votes to Senator Goldwater as "favorite son" candidate for President. This action brings the Senator's total delegates for the No. 1 position to 27 (the South Carolina GOP pledged its 13 delegates to him on April 2).

**Labor Front:** Earl Warren's Supreme Court ran true to form last week with a decision on a labor case in which it backed the labor boss side for the third time this year. The case concerned a 1954 contract between a Michigan manufacturing firm and the Machinists' union, calling for a union shop. The contract was signed at a time when the union did not represent a majority of the workers—a violation of the Taft-Hartley Law. A worker appealed to the NLRB for a refund of her union dues. The NLRB ruled in her favor. The Supreme Court overruled the NLRB on the basis that the worker had filed suit after the six months statute of limitations had run out.

Legalists agree that it is arguable both ways. But students of labor law point out that the Court, as usual, leans over backwards in rendering a decision against the individual worker and in favor of a union contract between employer and union. Labor law experts point out the danger of this decision—that an employer and a union may very quietly make a union shop contract and individual workers may not be aware of its nature until the statute of limitations has run out. The Supreme Court ruled 7 to 2 against the individual worker and the NLRB. Justices Frankfurter and Whittaker dissented.

**Kennedy:** As Capital pundits discourse on whether Jack Kennedy is victim or beneficiary regarding the "Catholic issue," many come to the conclusion that the Bay State Senator may be attempting to hold a religious blackjack over the heads of Democratic leaders.

After Kennedy's recent speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in which he dwelt almost entirely on the subject of his religion, not a few of the veteran newsmen recalled the contrast between Jack's tactics and the position Al Smith took during the 1928 Presidential campaign. Smith seldom mentioned religion. In his last inaugural speech as New York's Governor he stated: "I should be a poor American and a poor Catholic alike if I injected religious discussion into a political campaign."

Evidence that Kennedy has already used his religion as a political selling point is found in *John Kennedy, A Political Profile*, by James MacGregor Burns, a Kennedy booster.

Wrote Burns of Kennedy's attempt to win his party's Vice-Presidential nomination in 1956: "The main problem was the Catholic issue. [His staff] delved into voting records and came up with a detailed analysis claiming to demonstrate that a Catholic running mate would be a definite advantage to a Protestant candidate.

*"Adorned with tables and footnotes, the long analysis argued that there was a Catholic vote [one of Jack's major current disclaimers] . . . . Later on, this intriguing document was quietly let out to reporters as an analysis drawn up by 'backers' of Kennedy." Burns added that the planting was so skillful that* US News & World Report *published the whole account, and* Time *a long summary, on the eve of the convention.*

Reportedly older and more experienced party heads (the vociferously pro-Kennedy Paul Butler not included) are trying to prevail on the young



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contender to begin thinking of the party first and stop making personal use of the issue.

This thinking was reflected in an April 15 Baltimore *Sun* editorial which stated that Kennedy had banked from the beginning of his career on a "Catholic vote." The *Sun* continued: "He proved it [the existence of a Catholic vote in the Wisconsin primary] perhaps too well, since the question now dominates his candidacy and party leaders are reflecting that if there is a 'Catholic vote' there is also an 'anti-Catholic vote' that could rip the party, and conceivably the general electorate, wide open."

**De Gaulle:** The French President made a big hit in the Nation's Capital during his visit here last week —but not for the reasons the "liberal" papers played up.

**What drew the plaudits of the Nation's solons was De Gaulle's generous praise for West Germany —giving proof that he was not affected by Nikita Khrushchev's anti-German propaganda during the latter's French visit.**

For De Gaulle's greatest achievement, students of European affairs say, is the Franco-German *rapprochement* — which no Frenchman has been able to achieve since Charlemagne. Congressman Wint Smith (R.- Kans.) expressed the sentiments of many legislators when he commented, "In our lifetime we've never heard a Frenchman say the kind of things about Germany that De Gaulle said here."

But Smith also sounded a warning: "In a while we may see a bunch of one-worlders trying to break up that alliance—with the British in there helping." Other Congressmen agree, and not a few, familiar with the wiles of the British, are convinced that Britain's distinct coolness toward De Gaulle and Adenauer (as displayed in anti-German demonstrations earlier this year) provides the key to American "liberals'" failure to mention the new accord on the Continent. Britain, it is said, wants to split up France and Germany, to regain her position as the "balance of power" in Europe, and to destroy the Common Market, which threatens British trade—always the key element in Albion's foreign policy. The "liberals," as ever sympathetic to Britain, correspondingly played down De Gaulle's German policy—and in its place emphasized their pet "ban the bomb" theme.

**Stevenson vs. Scientists:** Adlai Stevenson is loudly claiming credit for being the first to propose a nuclear test ban four years ago, and his posture as "champion of disarmament" is receiving warm words of praise from the "liberal" press. But the cold-sober testimony of some of the Nation's top scientists indicates that neither in 1956 nor 1960 does Stevenson (or any of the other Democratic hopefuls now echoing his line) have any grasp of the steps needed to achieve disarmament safely. This was brought out in the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently.

*For the scientists (including some avowed "liberal" Democrats) agreed that an adequate control system would require 600 stations in Russia to detect clandestine tests, rather than the 21 the US proposed in 1958 at the Geneva talks (based on scientific data then available), or the "absolutely none" the Russians have so far agreed to. Recent tests have shown that underground explosions could be muffled so that the 21 stations they originally thought would be enough will provide totally inadequate inspection, the scientists agreed.*

The "liberal" press, faithfully polishing Stevenson's image, glossed over the testimony by singling out for attack Dr. Edward Teller, "father of the H-bomb," and noting that he opposes any test ban. But Teller was joined by, among others, Dr. Richard Roberts of the Carnegie Institution, who is vice chairman of the Democratic Advisory Committee on Science and Technology. He called for at least 125 stations, and disarmament advocate Dr. Hans Bethe of Cornell University said 600 would be needed. (Since testifying Roberts has signed a Democratic Advisory Committee report calling for 600 stations.) Even 600 stations will not give total protection, said Dr. Harold Brown; tests below one kiloton could not be detected.

**How to Clear Slums:** While the House last week passed a billion dollar housing bill and Congress will appropriate $300 million for urban renewal July 1, Dr. Frederick G. Reuss, professor of economics at Goucher College had another answer for improved housing: private enterprise.

Writing in the Baltimore *Sun*, Dr. Reuss says he's "perfectly willing" to pay slum clearance taxes if private capital, under the proper taxing system, can't do the job. But right now, he insists, we "tax slums into existence." By over-taxing good housing, he claims, we take away incentive to keep values up. And once the area is blighted, it's reassessed at a low value and thus "we pay a tax-premium for poor up-keep." Then we rezone it, permit multiple dwellings and the "slum producer has his reward: high return, low maintenance cost, low tax value." Private housing is discouraged, public housing seems necessary, and public subsidized housing then drives out private housing, making even more public housing seem necessary.


**THE ACA-INDEX**

A Stark Appraisal of the Voting Record of Each United States Senator (1955-1959) and Representative (1957-1959). Now, for the first time, you can have at your finger tips an easily-understood *evaluation* of those who represent you in Congress.

**HUMAN EVENTS 408 First St., S. E., Wash. 3, D. C.**

Please send me the ACA-INDEX, at the pre-publication price of $12.50 (after May 19: $15).

☐ Payment Enclosed ☐ Bill Me.

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....




PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Reuss feels that bad housing would no longer be a problem if a tax is put on the *potential* use of the land rather than the real use.

*"If we would say, instead," says Dr. Reuss, "that in a given area a lot has a tax value of a stated amount, say* $10,000, *and would keep the zoning line against misuses, no doubt even the slowest mind would find out that an outhouse on a* $10,000 *lot is an unprofitable use. Decent and liveable homes would have to be built in order to keep the real land value above the tax value, or else the tax would drive the owner out."*

**House Un-American Activities Committee:** Congressman Gordon Scherer (R.-Ohio) stated last week that Jimmy Roosevelt (D.-Calif.), in calling for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has "ignored the repeated warnings of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that the threat of internal subversion is greater than ever before."

Scherer claimed that " a new low in Congressional debate was reached" when Roosevelt charged the Committee with being more dangerous than most of what it investigates. The Republican Congressman said that during his eight years on the Committee he had heard "arrogant, surly, hard core Communists" make the charge, but "never did I expect a colleague on the floor to make this charge in an effort to discredit a committee of the Congress and its members."

Scherer said that a year ago when Roosevelt introduced his resolution to abolish the Committee and transfer its work to the Judiciary Committee, he had claimed he wanted to strengthen the investigation of subversion.

Now, said Scherer, Roosevelt "has joined the clamor of the far left for complete abolition. This is what he wanted in the first place."

**Education Front:** A classic example of bureaucratic law-making has come to the attention of education experts in the Capital.

Under the Housing Act of 1950, Congress provided public funds for college housing. In 1958, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, by administrative order, decided that "college housing" included fraternity and sorority houses, if they were owned by the school and not the fraternity. As a result, $2.5 million of the taxpayers' funds is about to be given to the University of Arizona to build eleven fraternities and one sorority.

Fraternities and sororities, which house fewer students than dormitories, cost more per capita to build, a spokesman for the Housing and Home Finance Agency admitted. Moreover, fraternity chapters, which are backed by well-to-do national organizations, have little trouble borrowing private funds to build new houses—so that they have little need for public money. Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which handles housing bills, expressed surprise when informed that funds were to be spent for such buildings.

• "A boondoggle of the worst order" is the reaction on Capitol Hill to the Democratic Advisory Committee's proposal that the US Government foot the bill for 500,000 foreign students to come to US colleges each year. The cost was not given by the Democrats, but experts here put the figure at over $1 billion each year—excluding transportation from overseas. "Where would we put them?" one expert asked. "Colleges are frequently overcrowded now—especially the top schools these foreign students will want to go to. If we admit 500,000 a year, we either have to provide facilities for that many—at enormous cost—or else deprive 500,000 Americans of the chance to go to college. American colleges now only have 3 million students—are we supposed to give one place in every six to a foreign student automatically, regardless of qualifications?"

**Unemployment Compensation:** A retired man earning $188 monthly from his company, another $1800 a year from a profit sharing plan, plus Social Security, applies for unemployment compensation in Pennsylvania and is handed out $2000 tax-free. A 12-year-old child actor, who refused a part paying $28 a day because he was used to $100 a day, asks —and gets—unemployment pay in California.

**These and thousands of similarly documented stories are the shocking findings of a diligent reporter for Readers Digest, Kenneth Gilmore, who found that millions of dollars a year is showered —not on the truly unemployed—but on cheaters, freeloaders and bums. Gilmore's report appears in the April issue.**

While Congress considers the Kennedy-Karsten bill to disburse more funds (naturally) and put unemployment compensation completely under Federal control, Gilmore claims the reason for the appalling flow of funds to mountebanks has been the Federal Government's Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor.

The BES, which has the power to impound the unemployment taxes of states that do not bow before its rules, has hacked away at the states' restrictions on collecting jobless checks. It has told them it is "unnecessary as well as undesirable" to exclude married women from jobless pay. And it has told them to write laws "in broad terms with no specific requirement that claimants be actively seeking work."

**In Memoriam:** A New York *Daily News* reader commented last week: "May 2 will be the third anniversary of the death of Joe McCarthy. The least we can do for him is say a prayer."

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.**
**For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.**
**Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.**

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
*Assistant Editors*
JOHN R. BENEDICT NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 18 — Section III

HUMAN EVENTS

MAY 5, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

# Stop Sugar Coating Castro!

*By* THE HON. STYLES BRIDGES
*Senior Republican member of the US Senate*

AMERICAN SOLDIERS and sailors died to bring freedom to Cuba sixty-two years ago. American doctors and plague specialists fought heroically to rid that island paradise of the centuries-old curse of yellow fever and other diseases. Excepting perhaps only Canada, the United States' relations with Cuba have been closer and friendlier than relations with any other country in the Western Hemisphere. Several million American tourists have flocked to Cuba since World War I. The Cuban people have always regarded and treated us as friends. Artificially whipped up anti-American hatred, while common in some other Latin American lands, never developed to any serious proportions in Cuba. We liked the Cubans and they liked us.

All this is now ended, thanks to "Dr." Fidel Castro. Orwell's "Two Minutes Hate," in his remarkably prescient book, *1984*, is now being literally carried out almost every night by Big Brother Fidel over Cuban radio and TV stations. Only the "Two Minutes Hate" has been stretched out to three and four *hour* "Hate America" harangues.

President Eisenhower's recent speech warned the people of Cuba that while we have the deepest concern for their welfare and future security, we cannot continue forever to keep on swallowing insults and abuse, nor can we be expected to stand by passively while American property is confiscated, American newsmen are abused and mistreated and American citizens are thrown into prison on flimsy or trumped up charges.

*Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, when he was in Cuba, complimented Castro on the seizure of foreign property with promises of ultimate payment. He thought the Castro regime was quite "generous" in offering to pay anything at all for seized property—the Bolsheviks in Russia seized everything and did not even bother to issue paper receipts, Mikoyan boasted.*

Just before he departed from Cuba, Mikoyan signed an agreement with Castro to buy five million tons of Cuban sugar over a period of five years, or a million tons a year. As in all Soviet deals, there was a hidden hook. Only 200,000 tons will be paid for in cash, the rest will be strictly barter for Soviet manufactured goods—at Soviet fixed prices, needless to add.

The Soviets will pay only the world price for sugar which is a few cents under $3 a hundredweight. *It costs Cuba a trifle over* $4 *per hundredweight to produce sugar.* We pay Cuba cash and around $5.50 per hundredweight. So the loss that Castro will take selling his sugar to Russia will come out of the $150 million bonus above world prices which we pay him for our sugar! It would seem to me that as long as Castro is so pleased to sell his sugar to the Soviets at a loss of over a cent a pound, we should cut our Cuban sugar quota in the same amounts as he increases his sales to Russia.

Mikoyan also assured Castro that Russia would not dump or resell this sugar in the world market. This was really a noble and big-hearted gesture on the wily Armenian's part! I have discovered a little secret which all the newspaper and other accounts of the Cuban sugar deal missed completely. I had one of my staff phone the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to find out what sugar sells for in the land of the Soviets. The answer was "roughly five rubles a pound." Depending on which exchange rate one uses, this makes sugar come to a minimum of 45 cents to a maximum of $1.12 a pound in the land of "Socialism!" The average Russian worker earns 800 rubles a month. So a month's work will get him 160 pounds of sugar. An American worker under much abused "capitalism" can earn the same amount in one day's work at $16 a day.

So the Soviets buy crude sugar from Castro at under 3 cents a pound and resell it to their own people for 45 cents a pound. This amounts to 42 cents a pound profit for refining and transport. *This is Socialism?* Any capitalist government which practiced such an extortionate holdup on its own people for an every-day household commodity would be thrown out of office in 24 hours.

*Nor can I resist observing that none of our "liberal" commentators or columnists caught this cute little swindle in the Castro-Mikoyan sugar deal. They never do!*

ONE-THIRD of all the sugar used in this country comes from Cuba. We have been paying an average price of $5.50 a hundred pounds for Cuban sugar. Last year Cuba had a carry-over of some 660,000 tons. This year it is estimated that the Cuban surplus will reach 1,400,000 tons. All the rest of Latin America is allowed to sell less than 275,000 tons of sugar to this country.

There are a number of Caribbean area and South American countries with great quantities of surplus sugar which they are eager to sell us. Brazil has a carry-over of 1,200,000 tons, Mexico 500,000, Dominican Republic 174,000 Argentina 250,000 and Peru 90,000 tons. Jamaica and other British colonies in the West Indies, Guatemala, and several other Central American countries are estimated to have another 100,000 tons of surplus sugar which they would be delighted to sell in this country at the same price as we pay Castro—for sugar mixed with poisonous Red insults and continuous indignities. This makes some 2,334,000 tons of sugar available from Latin America and the Caribbean, to say nothing of possibly another 500,000 from Hawaii, the Philippines, Formosa, and other Pacific sugar producers. In other words, our real friends are

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eager to sell us all the sugar we need without buying a single pound from Castro.

The Department of Agriculture, in a recent bulletin, stated that the price of refined sugar in this country was the highest since 1920. American taxpayers, housewives, and children buying candy in effect make up the $150 million favored-nation sugar subsidy we are now paying Castro. With this money Castro has reputedly sent a purchasing emissary to East Germany to look into the possibility of buying some submarines. The same purchasing agent was also reported as having been in Prague looking for planes and other weapons after Great Britain had refused to sell Castro jet fighters. I need not elaborate on the mischief-making possibilities in the Caribbean which a few submarines and a good air force would give the Castro brothers and their Communist guerrilla warfare advisors so eager to "liberate" their neighbors from the alleged "thralldom of American imperialism."

WHILE CASTRO is shopping around Europe for modern weapons with which allegedly to protect his revolution against the big, bad imperialists, Cuban imports from the United States last year dropped $110 million. In 1958 Cuba bought $546,200,000 of American products and commodities. Under Castro and "Che" Guevara, a professional Communist revolutionary from Argentina, Cuba's imports of US goods have dropped to $436,707,000. In his war against Santa Claus and Christmas, Castro last winter even banned the importation of American Christmas trees!

Nations are no different from the people who compose them. No one admires self-abasement, timidity, or weakness. Everyone, regardless of race, creed, or cultural development, respects character, self-respect, integrity—in brief, the man or country which stands up for its rights and dignity. I feel most strongly that the present disgraceful, dangerous, and intolerable situation in Cuba cannot be permitted to go on much longer. Our position throughout Latin America is rapidly deteriorating. Other adventurers and Soviet inspired revolutionaries are being encouraged to emulate Castro and also to spit in Uncle Sam's face.

I will support legislation giving the President a greater degree of flexibility in fixing Cuba's annual sugar quota and prices. I believe firmly that Cuba's sugar quota should be lowered not as an act of "punitive retaliation" but simply because of the age-old buyer's prerogative of trading with his friends and bypassing his enemies.

Now that Castro has made it plain that he wants to "shake off the slavery of American imperialism" and become a ward of the Soviets there seems to be little that we can do and still retain our self-respect. Castro will learn by bitter experience the wisdom of an old Russian adage, "He who sups with the Devil had better have a very long spoon."

With Castro and his bully boys constantly screaming hatred against America by press and radio, it strikes me that American tourists—that is, those few who still go to Cuba—are taking serious risks against which the State Department should warn them.

Mobs are easily incited. Just a few years ago several Americans who happened to be passing through Baghdad were literally torn to pieces in the streets by blood-crazed mobs who had been incited by Communist broadcasters.

I feel sure that the State Department can find ways and means of discouraging all tourist traffic to Cuba until Castro and his bewhiskered bravos are removed from the scene by a more responsible government.

I, for one, want to re-establish our long-standing friendship with the Republic of Cuba. However, we cannot do this, and retain our national honor and prestige, with an irresponsible regime which flagrantly violates all international laws and solemn obligations by one-sided, executive fiat. I refer to to wholesale, Communist-type confiscation of American property, and the continual mistreatment and abuse of American citizens. The recent outrage of holding and grilling a completely innocent American free-lance photographer who happened to be a passenger on the French ship which exploded in Havana is a case in point.

**Castro's outrageous charges, that somehow our Government must have been implicated in the explosion, are hardly conducive to the resumption of friendly relations, as the State Department pointed out.**

If there is any scurrilous and completely unfounded charge against this country that Castro or his radio and press echoes have not made during the past 15 months, I simply cannot think of it. They seem to have missed nothing in their long list of alleged villainies against us.

I sincerely hope that the day is not far off when the traditional friendship forged between our two countries 62 years ago in our joint war for the liberation of Cuba can be firmly and permanently re-established. I doubt that this is possible under the Castro brothers' regime or that Castro and his Communist advisors have any such desire or intention. And if it is their plan to convert Cuba into a Communist base of operations against the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere, as many intelligence officers and experts are convinced is the case, then all gestures of friendship on our part are merely a stultifying waste of time.


HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "STOP SUGAR COATING CASTRO!" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies, $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,C00 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____





PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 18 — Section IV HUMAN EVENTS MAY 5, 1960

LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

# The Church and Politics

*By* J. HOWARD PEW

IT IS MY CONSIDERED OPINION that, if the United Presbyterian Church is to pay our retired ministers a pension which will enable them to live decently; if it is to maintain its position by helping to finance churches in thousands of new community centers springing up all over this country; and if it is to do its fair share in the fields of missions and education—the corporate church could wisely spend at least twice as much as it now receives.

Why does not our church receive adequate money for these purposes?

> **It is generally conceded that there is more wealth represented in our church than is to be found in any other denomination; and yet there are 26 denominations whose benevolences per communicant greatly exceed ours—in fact, one of these, a tenth our size, receives more money for benevolences than we do. Of course, all of these denominations are much smaller than ours. Are we to be excused, however, for not raising our share simply because we have more people to deal with?**

In order to obtain the answers to these questions, I have discussed them with many men in business and in the professions who are dedicated Christian members of our church. Many of these men could afford to give far more than they do. Most of them give liberally to charity, moderately to their local churches, and not at all to the corporate church. A few of them will give when we demonstrate the needs; but the great majority are strongly opposed to much of what the corporate church is doing.

They cannot understand how our corporate church could tolerate such statements and pronouncements on social issues as they have seen in the press. They feel that the corporate church should not go into politics; that it has no mandate to meddle in secular affairs. They know that the National Council of Churches is composed of representatives from the denominations, and therefore is a creature of the denominations. When the National Council of Churches makes a statement, they naturally assume that if our denomination does not repudiate such a statement, it must be in favor of it. They feel that many of those who are primarily responsible for these statements have neither the knowledge nor the competence to make them. They know, too, that these pronouncements frequently coincide with the Communist objectives.

Let us take a look at some of the statements which have stirred up so much controversy. A case in point was the so-called World Order Study Conference, whose findings were widely publicized in the newspapers throughout the United States. Typical of this publicity was the news story carried in the New York *Times*:

> **Cleveland, November 21—Leaders of American Protestantism voted unanimously today in favor of United States recognition of Communist China and its admission to the UN. The vote was taken at the end of the four-day World Order Study Conference sponsored by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA. The Council represents 27 major Protestant bodies and 6 eastern orthodox groups.**

Here we have it in so many words that American Protestantism throughout the length and breadth of our land favors recognition of Red China. Not a word in the entire news story indicates that the Conference spoke only for its individual members, although the National Council of Churches assures us that this was the case.

It is pretty generally agreed that ethically no organization should permit any committee, council or conference which it may set up, to publish its report unless it is first approved by such organization, otherwise the public erroneously concludes that such a report expresses the convictions of that organization. In this case, the National Council of Churches did not approve the report of its Conference. Reliable polls subsequently taken revealed the fact that even 85 per cent of the ministers opposed recognition of Red China. Thus the Conference, instead of speaking for Protestantism, represented but a small percentage of its constituency.

WHEN OUR GENERAL ASSEMBLY met a year ago, opportunity was afforded to make amends for misleading the public by repudiating the report of the World Order Conference. Our church not only failed to avail itself of this opportunity, but it endorsed the report of its Social Action group, which report, referring to the World Order Conference, stated:

> **First, that its delegates and conferences spoke only for themselves;**
>
> **Second, that it has provoked not only responsible discussion, but irresponsible censure; and,**
>
> **Third, that immediate recognition may not be feasible.**

When the delegates to the General Assembly approved this report, did they realize that they were in effect accusing 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the members of our church of being irresponsible?

Other statements about which there is a wide difference of opinion deal with: collective bargaining, capital punishment, alcohol, planned parenthood, segregation, international trade and other international relationships, public housing, public education, United Nations, dictating to Government its policies on agriculture, natural resources, and all manner of relationships between Government and people, etcetera, etcetera.

For 60 years most of my time and energy have been devoted to the oil industry. It might be possible for me to give an intelligent answer to 10 per cent of the problems incident to petroleum. Petroleum represents but a small segment of industry—industry but a segment of our economy, and our economy but a part of human relationships. Is it possible for this social action group, or any other group of men, to have the knowledge and

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

competence to pass judgment on the whole gamut of human relationships?

Now, there are certain right and proper functions which the corporate church should perform without compromise and irrespective of the interests of any group. I have not heard business and professional men seriously criticize the operations of our local churches. They do, however, complain that the church has erred on three counts:

> **First, that many of these statements are contrary to both Natural Law and the freedoms and rights guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights;**
>
> **Second, that the corporate church had no mandate from its members to make these statements;**
>
> **Third, and more importantly, that many of these statements clearly violate the Constitution of our church and the basic tenets of Protestantism.**

As to the first point, these men believe that American enterprise, as presently practiced and commonly referred to as the capitalistic system, has been the greatest material boon to mankind ever devised in the history of the world. They believe that capitalism can exist only in an atmosphere of freedom; that freedom is a Christian concept; and that one of the cornerstones of Christianity is morality. Many of them understand and believe in the philosophy that inspired our Founding Fathers to write the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence.

Our Founding Fathers were a strongly religious people. They knew that one of the first things Christianity teaches us is that man must so discipline himself that he will govern his life in accordance with the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule.

They knew, too, that every government down through the corridors of time had usurped more and more power over the lives and activities of the people, until they had been reduced to a state of serfdom. They recognized that some government was necessary if order was to be maintained; but they were also convinced that the more Divine Authority the people would accept as a rule for their conduct, the less governmental authority would be necessary. And so they set up a pattern to live by, in which Christianity, morality, self-discipline, freedom and limited government all played an important part. The writings of our forebears are replete with this philosophy. George Washington in his Farewell Address said:

> **Religion and morality are the indispensable supports of freedom.**

And so these members of our church have concluded that, inasmuch as many of these statements and pronouncements violated their individual freedoms, the church was acting outside of its proper sphere.

As to the second point, they contended that the corporate church should not make such sweeping statements, because they do not represent the views of their constituency.

As to the third point, I talked to and corresponded with many ministers in our denomination.

A number of ministers quoted John Calvin's remarks referring to Luke 12:

> **Our Lord intended to draw a distinction between the political kingdoms of this world and the government of His church: because He had been appointed by the Father to be a Teacher, but was not a magistrate to divide inheritances . . . .**

One minister wrote to me as follows:

> **From the beginning of Presbyterianism, the separate jurisdiction of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities was a distinction firmly grasped and clearly expressed by our Reformed Fathers. In the Second Book of Discipline, agreed upon in the General Assembly of 1578, it is expressly declared that only ecclesiastical things be handled in the Assemblies, and that there be no meddling with anything pertaining to the civil jurisdiction.**

Another minister called my attention to the inaugural address of Philip Schaff, the eminent historian, who, when installed as Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary of New York in 1887, stated:

> **The church, as such, has nothing to do with the state except to obey its laws and to strengthen its moral foundations; the state has nothing to do with the church except to protect her in her property and liberty . . . .**

AND FINALLY ONE clergyman pointed out that today our Committee on Social Education and Action has in effect declared that God wants the 86th Congress to establish a permanent civil rights commission; that the Will of God is expressed against right-to-work laws, and in favor of birth control; that God would have the Federal Government exercise more control over the States; that the Holy Spirit directs the United States to recognize Red China, and has decreed that collective bargaining must be employed to solve labor disputes.

These ministers would resolve the third point in the negative; that the corporate church should not speak outside its ecclesiastical sphere.

Many of our business and professional men do not realize that the very freedoms to which they aspire can exist in a country only where the people generally accept the attributes of Christianity as a rule for their conduct. And so, if they would have these freedoms, they must support their church. If there are some things about the church they believe to be wrong, they should help to correct them. But they must work from the inside. Only in this way can their efforts be effective.

---

J. Howard Pew is a former president of the Sun Oil Company. A dedicated believer in the concepts upon which the Presbyterian Church was built, he has for many years been a leading spokesman for the laymen of that institution.


ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE CHURCH AND POLITICS"

at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____




PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED